

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/774,913	01/30/2001	David Northway	PALM-3571.US.P	5444	
759	90 07/13/2004		EXAM	INER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			OSORIO, RICARDO		
Third Floor Two North Market Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
San Jose, CA 95113			2673	<	
			DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004	4 (

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ŋ

Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applic	Applicant(s)				
		09/774,91	3	NORT	NORTHWAY, DAVID				
		Examiner		Art Un	it				
		RICARDO		2673					
The MAILING DATE of this comm Period for Reply	unication app	ears on the	cover sheet wit	h the correspo	indence addres	is			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMML - Extensions of time may be available under the provisi after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirt - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for re Any reply received by the Office later than three montle earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	INICATION. ons of 37 CFR 1.13 ommunication. y (30) days, a reply n statutory period w eply will, by statute, hs after the mailing	36(a). In no eve / within the statu vill apply and will , cause the appli	nt, however, may a re tory minimum of thirty expire SIX (6) MONT cation to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be co HS from the mailing	onsidered timely. g date of this commu .C. § 133).	inication.			
Status									
1) Responsive to communication(s)	filed on 19 A	oril 2004.	<i>/</i> +						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL .									
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to res	s/are withdrav	wn from con							
Application Papers									
9)☐ The specification is objected to by	the Examine	r.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/a	re: a)∐ acce	epted or b)[objected to b	y the Examin	er.				
Applicant may not request that any ol			•		• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) includ									
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119									
12) Acknowledgment is made of a clair a) All b) Some * c) None of 1. Certified copies of the prior 2. Certified copies of the prior 3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation	: ity documents ity documents es of the prior tional Bureau	s have beer s have beer rity docume ı (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Ap nts have been re e 17.2(a)).	oplication No.		ge			
Attachment(s)									
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 Paper No(s)/Mail Date			4) Interview St. Paper No(s) 5) Notice of Int 6) Other:)/Mail Date formal Patent App	<u>.</u> .	2)			

Application/Control Number: 09/774,913

Art Unit: 2673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulon et al (5,712,760) in view of Kamikakai et al (6,154,359) and Miller, Jr. (6,392,870). Regarding claims 1-2 and 10-11, Coulon teaches of a computer system having a portable computer (Fig. 3a, reference character 302) and a segmented keyboard for providing user inputted data for said portable computer and coupled to said computer, comprising a compliment of input keys comprising a segmented keyboard (Fig. 2b, reference character 226); a central keyboard portion (Fig. 3a, reference character 306); a first flippable portion (Fig. 3a, reference character 310) hinged to said central portion and having an open and closed position; a second flippable portion (Fig. 3a, reference character 312) hinged to said central portion and having an open and closed position; an attachable numeric keypad, adapted to be optionally coupled with a flippable hinged portion of said segmented keyboard (Fig. 3a, reference character 326, these keys are clearly the numeric keypad keys of a standard keyboard); a rotatatable hinge coupled with said segmented keyboard (Fig. 3a, reference character 314); and an electrical connector coupled to the rotatable hinge (col. 6, lines 9-12), said electrical connector is adapted to couple said segmented keyboard with a portable computer system (col. 6, lines 9-12).

However, Coulon fails to teach of a second rotatable hinge coupled with said rotatable hinge. Kamikakai teaches teach of a second rotatable hinge coupled with a first rotatable hinge (col. 3, lines 56-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the second rotatable hinge, as taught by Kamikakai, in the device of Coulon so that the display part and the keyboard part can turn independently of each other (col. 5, lines 43-47).

Further, the combined device of Coulon and Kamikakai do not specifically teach that said electrical connector detachably couples said segmented keyboard to a portable electronic device. Miller teaches of an electrical connector detachably coupling said segmented keyboard to a portable electronic device; the connector orients the hand-held device for convenient viewing of a device display when using the keyboard (see col. 9, lines 16-25 and col. 8, lines 62-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the electrical connector detachably coupling the keyboard, as taught by Miller, in the combined device of Coulon and Kamikakai because the keyboard connector is conventionally known (col. 8, lines 64-65) in the art of electrical connectors to avoid messy cabling and detach the keyboard from the electronic device as desired to increase the size and weight of the device only while using.

Application/Control Number: 09/774,913

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding claims 3 and 12, Coulon teaches that when said first flippable portion and said second flippable portion are in said open position a compliment of input keys are accessible to a user for said inputting of data (see Fig. 3a, reference characters 310 and 312).

Regarding claims 4 and 13, Coulon teaches that when said first flippable portion and said second flippable portion are in closed position, said segmented keyboard is of a size and shape approximate to the size and shape of a portable computer system (Figs 3b-3c, and col. 6, lines 17-21).

Regarding claims 5, 7, 14 and 16, the device of Coulon fails to teach of the first rotatable hinge adapted to provide angular positioning of said segmented keyboard to enable optimum ergonomic positioning of said segmented keyboard relative to an individual user.

Kamikakai teaches of the first rotatable hinge adapted to provide angular positioning of said segmented keyboard to enable optimum ergonomic positioning of said segmented keyboard relative to an individual user (col. 2, lines 39-54, and col. 3, lines 56-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide angular positioning of said segmented keyboard, as taught by Kamikakai, in the combined device of Coulon, Kamikakai and Miller because the keyboard portion can turn independently to arbitrary rotary positions that include optimum ergonomic positions (col. 5, lines 43-47). Also, to enable easy operation of a palmtop information processing apparatus (col. 2, lines 49-54).

Regarding claims 6, 8, 15, 17 and 19, further, the device of Coulon fails to teach of the second rotatable hinge adapted to provide angular positioning of a portable computer system when said

Art Unit: 2673

portable computer system is coupled to said segmented keyboard to enable optimum view angle positioning of the display panel of said portable computer system relative to an individual user. Kamikakai teaches of the second rotatable hinge adapted to provide angular positioning of a portable computer system when said portable computer system is coupled to said segmented keyboard to enable optimum view angle positioning of the display panel of said portable computer system relative to an individual user (col. 2, lines 39-54, and col. 3, lines 56-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide optimum view angle positioning of the display panel, as taught by Kamikakai, in the device of Coulon, Kamikakai and Miller because the display portion can turn independently to arbitrary rotary positions that include optimum viewing positioning (col. 5, lines 43-47). Also, to enable easy operation of a palmtop information processing apparatus (col. 2, lines 49-54).

3. Claims 9, 18 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulon in view of Kamikakai and Miller as applied to claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19 above, and further in view of Wahl et al (6,101,676).

Regarding claims 9, 18 and 20, the device of Coulon, as anticipated by Kamikakai and Miller, fails to teach that the first and second rotatable hinges are clutch hinges adapted to maintain optimum ergonomic positioning of said segmented keyboard and optimum view angle positioning of a display panel of a portable computer system with regard to an individual user.

Art Unit: 2673

Wahl teaches of the use of clutch hinges that can be used to maintain optimum ergonomic positioning of said segmented keyboard and optimum view angle positioning of a display panel of a portable computer system with regard to an individual user (col. 1, lines 22-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use clutch hinges, as taught by Wahl, in the combined device of Coulon, Kamikakai and Miller to reduce the amount of force necessary to adjust the angular position of the display housing (col. 1, lines 39-42). Also, the same can clearly be said of the angular position of the keyboard part to get an optimum ergonomic position.

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2673

Page 7

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ricardo L. Osorio whose telephone number is (703) 305-2248. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu from 7:00 AM-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached at 305-4938.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

> Ricardo L. Osorio Examiner

Art Unit: 2673

RLO July 6, 2004

> BIPIN SHALWALA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600